

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of April 1, 2009, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 40 and 41 have been added and claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 31 and 33-35 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-24 and 31-44 are pending. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-16, 19-21 and 31-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,874, “Shaffer”) in view of Hirni *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,609, “Hirni”). Claims 5, 6, 10-12, 17, 18, 22-24 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Hirni and Salama *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,093, “Salama”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

“monitoring, at the router, a control signaling message transmitted between the two network end-points, the control signal message being component-specific for one of: separate audio, video and data component streams, the audio, video and data component streams each forming a separate media component of a plurality of separate media components of a multimedia stream transmitted between the two network end-points;...and

applying, at the router, a connection control issued by the service control point to the separate media components, wherein the connection control enables: modification of terminal capability information of the control signaling message related to the separate media components.”

Nowhere do any of the cited references teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, the modification of a control signaling message transmitted between the two network end-points and related to the separate media components. The Office Action asserts at p. 4 that Shaffer describes modification of a control signaling message at col. 4, ll. 38-44. The cited passage merely describes establishing a connection among two or more terminals and formatting the control streams into messages for communication via the network interface. Even assuming, without conceding, that the formatting of the control stream constitutes modification of a control signaling message, nowhere does Shaffer teach or suggest modifying terminal capability information of the control stream. That is, the mere formatting of a control stream into a

communication message does not describe modifying particular information (i.e., terminal capability information) of the control stream. Hirni and Salama also fail to teach or suggest the above recited features and thus, do not cure the deficiencies of Shaffer. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-12 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 13 and 31 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, “one or more detection points configured to report to at least one of routing means and the service control point in response to a trigger.” None of the cited references, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests a detection point, in a network system, configured to reporting at a routing means or a service control point in response to a trigger. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 14-24 and 32-39 are dependent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims

Claims 40 and 41 have been added. Support for the features recited therein may be found throughout the originally filed Specification, e.g., at p. 10, line 34 – p. 11, line 21 (claim 40) and at p. 11, ll. 4-7 and p. 12, ll. 6-24 (claim 41).

Claim 40 is dependent on claim 13 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13. Additionally, claim 40 recites, “wherein the one or more detection points are configured to report at least one of a logical channel opening message and a logical channel closing message.” None of the cited references, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such a feature. Accordingly, claim 40 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 41 is dependent on claim 1 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claim 41 recites, “intercepting, at the router, a logical channel description for one or more of the separate media components; notifying a service control point about the separate media components; and receiving, at the router, a modified logical channel description from the service control point.” Nowhere do any of the cited references, separately or in

combination, teach or suggest such features. While Shaffer generally describes the opening and closing of logical channels (e.g., col. 4, ll. 25-30), Shaffer lacks a teaching or suggestion of a router receiving *modified* logical channel description, much less from a service control point. Hirni and Salama are similarly deficient. Accordingly, claim 41 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: July 1, 2009

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001